DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 041 UD 015 032

AUTHOR Kuvlesky, William P.; Ohlendorf, George W.
TITLE Occupational Status Orientations of Negro Boys: A Rural-Urban Comparison.
PUB DATE Aug 66
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society meetings (Miami Beach, Florida, August 1966); Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Career Planning; Economic Status; *Goal Orientation; High School Students; *Negro Students; *Occupational Aspiration; Occupational Choice; Occupational Information; Psychological Characteristics; *Rural Urban Differences; Rural Youth; Social Status; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this paper is to provide information about occupational status orientations of Negro youth through analysis of data obtained from a recent study of high school sophomores residing in Texas. The specific objective of the research was to explore rural and urban differences among Negro boys on the following aspects of occupational orientations: goals and expectations, anticipatory deflection from goals, and the association of intensity of aspiration with anticipatory deflection. It was found that Negro boys in urban areas have higher occupational goals and expectations than their rural counterparts; however, differences are greater in reference to goals than for expectations. On the whole, rural and urban respondents were found to experience very similar rates of anticipatory deflection from occupational goals, but, in the case of high aspirants, differences were observed in reference to the nature of anticipatory deflection experienced. Urban Negroes were found to have stronger desires for their occupational goals than their rural counterparts. No meaningful association was found to exist between intensity of aspiration and anticipatory deflection from occupational goals for either grouping. Theoretical and practical implications were drawn and suggestions offered for future research in this problem area. (Author/JM)

ED105041

Texas Academy of Science

Occupational Aspirations and Expectations of Negro Boys.

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS ORIENTATIONS OF NEGRO BOYS: A RURAL-URBAN COMPARISON.*

William P. Kuvlesky and George W. Ohlendorf
Texas A&M University

Abstract

The major purpose of this paper is to provide information about occupational status orientations of Negro youth through analysis of data obtained from a recent study of high school sophomores residing in Texas. The specific objective of the research was to explore rural and urban differences among Negro boys on the following aspects of occupational orientations: goals and expectations; anticipatory deflection from goals; and the association of intensity of aspiration with anticipatory deflection. It was found that Negro boys in urban areas have higher occupational goals and expectations than their rural counterparts; however, differences are greater in reference to goals than for expectations. On the whole, rural and urban respondents were found to experience very similar rates of anticipatory deflection from occupational goals, but, in the case of high aspirants, differences were observed in reference to the nature of anticipatory deflection experienced. Urban Negroes were found to have stronger desires for their occupation goals than their rural counterparts. No meaningful association was found to exist between intensity of aspiration and anticipatory deflection from occupational goals for either grouping. Theoretical and practical implications were drawn and suggestions offered for future research in this problem area.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*Paper read at the Rural Sociological Society meetings, Miami Beach, Florida August, 1966.

UD015032

The Problem

Over the past twenty years a large quantity of research findings have been accumulated on the occupational aspirations and expectations of adolescents.[1] A review of these past efforts clearly indicates that "occupational status orientations"[2] of American youth are high relative to the probable opportunities existing in the occupational structure. This generalization appears to be valid for all types of youth--rural and urban,[3] male and female,[4] Negro and white,[5] as well as various age groupings.[6] At the same time, many of these studies have found that occupational goal-levels vary in relation to a number of different variables.[7]

In attempting to explain why rural migrants to cities seem to be disadvantaged in occupational mobility, Lipset has suggested that rural youth have lower occupational aspirations than urban youth.[8] With only two exceptions, past studies have supported Lipset's hypothesis as it pertains to males.[9] The exceptions include a Wisconsin study reported by Haller and Sewell and part of the findings of a Florida study reported by Middleton and Grigg in 1959.[10] This Florida study is apparently the only attempt to evaluate the relevance of Lipset's proposition of rural-urban goal differences for Negro youth.[11] Consequently, there seems to be an obvious need for additional research of the occupational status orientations of rural and urban Negro boys in order to further test the general validity of Lipset's hypothesis. Also, such information would be of current significance because it could provide insights into the critical problem of frustrated and dissatisfied Negro youth.[12]

The major purpose of this paper is to help meet the need for additional

information about the occupational status orientations of rural and urban Negro youth through analysis of data obtained from a recent study of male high school sophomores in Texas.[13]

Framework

Adolescents exist in a transitional state, where the present is largely consumed in preparation for future adult status--they are highly "future oriented."[14] Young people are oriented toward future attainment in a number of different social structures having status significance, and, occupation is one of the most important of these status areas.[15]

In examining the occupational status projections of individuals, it is useful to distinguish between aspirations and expectations.[16] An aspiration refers to a desired status, whereas, an expectation refers to an anticipated status attainment, which may or may not be desired. A number of researchers have found that youth do anticipate attaining jobs which differ from their stated occupational goals.[17] It is our contention that the relationship between goals and expectations can be conceptualized as an analytically distinct and researchable dimension of occupational status orientations. We will refer to this relational property, a lack of congruity between the two status orientations, as "anticipatory deflection."[18]

Numerous investigators have found that the extent of anticipatory deflection from occupational goals is associated with level of socio-economic status--the lower the SES, the greater is the negative deflection from goals.[19] Furthermore, evidence exists to indicate Negro youth experience a higher degree of anticipatory deflection from occupational goals than white youth.[20] But, as far as we can ascertain, no evidence has been reported on

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

rural-urban differences in anticipatory deflection for white or Negro youth.

Another objective of this paper was to explore the utility of a relatively overlooked dimension of occupational aspiration--the "orientation element."[21] If a youth says he wants to be a doctor, the goal element of aspiration has been indicated; however, we have no knowledge of how strongly he desires the goal. The orientation element refers to "intensity" or "strength" of desire for the goal element of the aspiration. Most past studies of occupational aspirations have been limited to investigation of the goal element--the status or status level of occupation that is desired. Several investigators have attempted to measure strength of the orientation element, but never in conjunction with occupational goals or expectations.[22] It seems logical to propose that intensity of desire for a goal could influence the occurrence of anticipatory deflection.[23] We intend to explore this proposition in reference to both our rural and urban respondents.

In summary, past research indicates that we can expect Negro boys to have high goals relative to their probable opportunities, and to experience marked anticipatory deflection from these goals. On the other hand, insufficient evidence is available to indicate what kind of differences, if any, exist between the occupational status orientations of rural and urban Negro boys.[24]

The specific objectives of the analysis to be reported here were to explore rural and urban differences among Negro youth for the following aspects of occupational status orientations: goals and expectations; and anticipatory deflection from goals; ~~and association of intensity of aspiration with anticipatory deflection.~~

Source and Collection of Data

The data on rural Negroes were obtained from a study of all high school sophomores[25] in three all-rural East Central Texas counties not contiguous to a metropolitan area.[26] All three counties had disproportionately high numbers of Negroes and low-income families as compared with Texas as a whole.[27] In order to obtain a comparable urban grouping for comparison, a fifty percent sample was taken of all sophomore homerooms in an all-Negro high school drawing students from a low-income ward in Houston.[28]

Only males will be considered in this analysis. Complete data was available for 97 rural and 108 urban males.[29] The data was obtained during April and May of 1966.

Indicators and Measurements

Two open-end questions were used to obtain responses that would serve as indicators of occupational goals and expectations.[30] The responses to both of these questions were coded according to a modified version of the widely used Census scheme.[31] Because the bulk of responses fell into the professional-technical-kindred category, this broad class was divided into three more specific categories--high professional, low professional, and glamour.[32] This operation made it possible to note differences among high level goal categories that otherwise would have been missed. In addition, these finer categories made it possible to detect anticipatory deflection occurring among relatively high goal and expectation levels. The categories used are as follows:

1. High Professional
2. Low Professional
3. Glamour

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. Owner, Manager, Official
5. Clerical and Sales
6. Skilled (craftsman and foreman)
7. Operatives
8. Unskilled (laborer)
9. No Information or "don't know"

Anticipatory deflection was determined by simply comparing the measures of goal and expectation. If they were incongruent, anticipatory deflection was considered to exist. A broad measure of nature of deflection, positive or negative direction, was determined by placing both goals and expectations in a rank hierarchy--indicated by the number of the occupational category given above. Positive deflection was judged to exist if expectation had a higher rank than goal. Negative deflection was assumed to exist if aspiration had the higher rank order.[33]

Several studies have attempted to measure strength or intensity of aspiration using a scale originally reported by Reissman.[34] This type of scale did not satisfy the needs of the larger study from which our data were taken. Therefore, a scale was constructed to indicate the importance of the respondent's occupational goal relative to other status goals.[35] The instrument is composed of seven status goals and is accompanied by a question that asks the respondent to numerically rank the attainment of these goals in their order of importance to him.[36] The relative importance given to the occupational goal is taken as a measure of intensity or desire for that goal.[37]

Findings

Occupational Goals and Expectations

Although a large majority of both rural and urban boys desired white-collar jobs, important differences in selection of more specific occupational goals were observed, Table 1. Urban youth aspired to high prestige profes-

Table 1. A Comparison of Rural and Urban Negro Boys' Occupational Goals.

Goal	Respondents		
	Rural (N=97)	Urban (N=108)	Total (N=205)
	----------%		
High Professional	7	21	15
Low Professional	26	35	31
Glamour	16	13	14
Managerial	5	9	7
Clerical and Sales	10	5	7
Skilled	11	9	10
Operatives	18	8	12
Unskilled	7	0	4
Total	100	100	100

$x^2 = 24.36$ D.F. = 7 P <.001

Table 2. A Comparison of Rural and Urban Negro Boys' Occupational Goal-Levels.

Goal-Level	Respondents		
	Rural (N=97)	Urban (N=108)	Total (N=205)
	----------%		
High	49	69	60
Intermediate	26	23	24
Low	25	8	16
Total	100	100	100

$x^2 = 13.89$ D.F. = 2 P <.001

sional positions at a rate three times greater than rural boys. Furthermore, they indicated a desire for lower prestige professional and technical jobs more often than rural youth. Conversely, rural boys selected low prestige jobs, blue-collar and white-collar, much more frequently than their urban counterparts.

To ascertain more clearly rural-urban differences in "level" of aspiration, the original eight occupational goal categories were collapsed into three broader level classes--high, intermediate, and low.[38] Even though it can be seen that a large proportion of both rural and urban Negro boys have high goals, marked differences were clearly observed. A much higher percentage of urban youth indicated a high goal-level, and, conversely, more rural youth indicated a low goal-level, Table 2. These findings clearly suggest that among Negro youth urban boys have higher occupational aspirations than rural boys.[39]

A finding of special significance was that very few (one urban and two rural) boys indicated a desire to farm.[40]

As was observed in reference to goals, the expectations of both rural and urban boys were generally high, Table 3. The profiles of rural and urban expectations are surprisingly similar in reference to most occupational categories--differing markedly, only, in reference to the high professional and operative types of jobs. Although the rural-urban differences existing for expectations were similar to those observed for goals (see Table 1), they were not as substantial. This observation is amplified when the original expectation categories are collapsed into three more inclusive ones, corresponding to the goal-level categories used earlier. The results clearly indicate that status-level differences are much smaller for expectations than

Table 3. A Comparison of Rural and Urban Negro Boys' Occupational Expectations.

Expectation	Respondents		
	Rural (N=97)	Urban (N=108)	Total (N=205)
	----------%		
High Professional	5	16	11
Low Professional	26	29	27
Glamour	14	12	13
Managerial	4	8	6
Clerical and Sales	6	6	6
Skilled	14	10	12
Operatives	24	9	16
Unskilled	5	4	5
No Information	2	6	4
Total	100	100	100

$x^2 = 14.47$ D.F. = 7 P < .05

Table 4. A Comparison of Differences in Goal-Levels and Expectation-Levels of Rural and Urban Negro Boys.

Level	Goal			Expectation		
	Rural (N=97)	Urban (N=108)	Difference in R-U %	Rural (N=97)	Urban (N=108)	Difference in R-U %
	-------%			----------%		
High	49	69	(20)	45	56	(11)
Intermediate	26	23	(3)	24	25	(1)
Low	25	8	(17)	31	19	(12)
Total	100	100		100	100	

$x^2 = 13.89$ D.F. = 2 P < .001 $x^2 = 4.50$ D.F. = 2 P > .10 < .20

for goals, Table 4.[41]

Even though the differences were not statistically significant, it is important to note that urban youth still expected to attain high level jobs more frequently, and lower status positions less frequently, than rural boys.

Anticipatory Deflection

Rural and urban boys did not differ markedly in the rate of anticipatory deflection experienced--it was observed for approximately one third of both groupings, Table 5.[42] When anticipatory deflection did occur, it was much more likely to be negative than positive.[43] Although the absolute proportions of rural and urban cases demonstrating deflection in either direction do not differ greatly, the urban ratio of negative to positive deflection was 5 to 1 compared to less than 2 to 1 for the rural boys. It can be inferred from this finding that, when deflection occurred, the urban boys were more likely to experience negative deflection than rural boys.

To see if the gross nature of the analysis reported above obscured rural urban differences in extent and direction of anticipatory deflection, we cross-classified the anticipatory deflection variable by goal categories and rural-urban residence. The only noteworthy result was that rural respondents having intermediate level goals tended to experience very high rates of deflection compared to all other types of aspirants, rural or urban, Table 6. In addition, we examined cases of high prestige white-collar goals involving anticipatory deflection to either other white-collar or blue-collar expectations. The rural-urban differences noted were consistent and usually marked in reference to each type of high prestige goal, Table 7. Rural respondents were more likely to anticipate blue-collar jobs and less likely to expect

Table 5. A Comparison Between Rural and Urban Negro Boys On Extent and Direction of Anticipatory Deflection From Occupational Goals.

Anticipatory Deflection	Rural (N=97)	Urban (N=108)
	----------%----------	
None (0)	66	70
Upward (+)	13	5
Downward (-)	21	25
Total	100	100

$x^2 = 3.92$ D.F. = 2 P .10 < .20

Table 6. A Cross-Classification of Anticipatory Deflection By Rural-Urban Residence and Type of Occupational Goal.

Occupational Goal	Rural				Urban			
	No.	(0)	(+)	(-)	No.	(0)	(+)	(-)
		------%-------				------%-------		
High Professional	7	71	0	29	23	70	0	30
Low Professional	25	76	0	24	38	71	3	26
Glamour	15	73	7	20	14	79	0	21
Managerial	5	40	20	40	10	60	20	20
Clerical and Sales	10	30	30	40	5	80	0	20
Skilled	11	46	36	18	10	60	20	20
Operatives	17	82	18	0	8	63	12	25
Unskilled	7	72	14	14	0	0	0	0

Table 7. A Comparison of Proportions of Rural and Urban Negro Respondents Deflected from Types of High Goals to Other White-Collar and Blue-Collar Expectations.

Type of Goal	Percent Deflected to			
	Other W-C Jobs		B-C Jobs	
	R	U	R	U
High Professional	0	10	29	17
Low Professional	0	18	24	11
Glamour	13	14	13	7
Managerial	20	30	40	10

Table 8. A Comparison of Rural and Urban Negro Boys on Level of Desire For Occupational Goals.

Level of Intensity	Rural* (N=97)	Urban* (N=108)	Total (N=205)
	----------	%	----------
Strong	34	54	45
Intermediate	43	32	37
Weak	23	14	18
Total	100	100	100
Mean Scores**	3.4	2.9	3.1

*$x^2 = 8.22$ D.F. = 2 $P < .02$

**$t = 1.02$ D.F. = 12 $P > .3$

white-collar jobs than were their urban counterparts.

Intensity of Aspiration

The purpose of this section of the paper is to examine the proposition that the intensity of desire involved in occupational aspirations is inversely related to rate of occurrence of anticipatory deflection from occupational goals. But first, let us examine a rural-urban comparison of intensity of aspiration scores (IA).*

A comparison of the mean rural and urban IA scores reveals a lower score for urban boys, indicating a higher intensity of aspiration; however, the difference was not statistically significant, Table 8. On the other hand, a chi square test on the frequency distributions of the rural and urban respondents over three intensity levels[44] indicated that differences were statistically significant, Table 8. These differences are marked and indicate that urban youth had stronger desires for their occupational goals than their rural counterparts. Of particular significance, almost one fourth of the rural respondents had weak desires for their occupational goals.

Our analysis of the relationship between IA and anticipatory deflection produced unexpected results--no meaningful relationship was observed. Consequently, it was concluded that IA was not associated with anticipatory deflection from occupational goals for either our rural or urban respondents. For a presentation of relevant data, specific findings, and possible explanations, see Appendix C.

---

*In reporting the findings, intensity of aspiration will be designated by the symbol "IA." It should be kept in mind that there is an inverse relationship between the scores and the intensity of desire indicated.

Summary

The findings of this study indicated that Negro boys from urban areas had higher occupational goals and expectations than their rural counterparts. Furthermore, these differences were found to be greater for goals than for expectations. In spite of the differences noted above, aspiration and expectation levels were generally high for both rural and urban boys. Expectations were generally lower than goals for both groupings. A finding of particular significance indicated that Negro boys from rural areas neither desired nor expected to farm.

On the whole, rural and urban respondents did not differ in rates of anticipatory deflection they experienced from occupational goals. For both groupings, anticipatory deflection occurred often and was predominately negative in direction. It was found that rural boys deflected from high goals were more likely to expect blue-collar jobs, and less likely to anticipate employment in white-collar positions, than similar urban boys.

In reference to intensity of aspiration, urban Negroes were found to have stronger desires for their occupational goals than their rural counterparts. However, no meaningful association was found to exist between intensity of aspiration and anticipatory deflection from occupational goals.

Discussion

Several of our findings have implications for Lipset's contention that rural youth have lower occupational aspirations than urban youth.[45] Our observation of differences in the goal-levels of rural and urban Negroes offers the first evidence to indicate that Lipset's hypothesis appears to be valid for Negro boys. Furthermore, the observation that rural and urban boys differ

less in their occupational expectations than in their aspirations appears to explain the only two studies purporting to contradict this hypothesis. The fact that these two studies were concerned with expectations and not, as indicated by the investigators, aspirations could account for the lack of rural-urban differences observed.[46] This finding--that rural-urban differences are greater for goals than expectations--also, appears to bring into question the general validity of Stephenson's contention that social class influences expectations more than goals.[47] In making this statement, we are assuming our rural respondents generally have lower socio-economic status than the urban.[48]

Lipset's hypothesis on rural-urban differences in occupational aspirations was offered as a partial explanation for the low attainments of rural migrants in the urban occupational structure.[49] Several of our findings provide insights that might lead to a more complete understanding of this phenomenon. ~~Of particular significance in this respect, is our finding~~ that urban boys ~~indicated a stronger desire for their occupational goals than did rural boys. There is no reason to believe that strength of desire for a goal~~ is less important than the goal-level in influencing subsequent attainment.[50] ~~Another~~ a possibility for broadening the explanation of this phenomenon is indicated by our observation that, for rural youth, deflection from high goals was associated with a tendency to anticipate employment in blue-collar jobs. At any rate, we propose that ~~intensity of aspiration and~~ anticipatory deflection, considered in conjunction with goal-level, probably offer a more adequate explanation of the rural migrant's low rate of mobility than simple differences in goal-levels. Research is needed to determine whether general rural-urban differences exist in reference to the orientation elements involved in this proposition, and equally as important, to determine to what

extent these elements influence attainment.[51]

Up to this point we have dwelled on the possible significance of the rural-urban differences observed. Despite these differences, a very high proportion of both Negro groupings were found to have high goals and expectations.[52] This general observation lends support to the contention that Negro youth have accepted the goals and values inherent in the broader culture.[53] This fact, considered in conjunction with the existence of formidable barriers to mobility,[54] indicates a potential for serious social conflict.[55] Several social scientists have speculated that a widening gap between status orientations and attainment explains, in part, outbreaks of mass hostility and high rates of criminal behavior among Negroes.[56]

This proposition strongly suggests that the study of status orientations held by Negroes is of more than academic importance. As an example, the following questions have particular social significance: To what extent does failure to attain occupational goals or expectations influence the level of social dissatisfaction among Negroes? Assuming some degree of relationship between this failure and dissatisfaction, what intervening conditions or experiences influence the magnitude of dissatisfaction? Does strength of aspiration have any bearing on these phenomena? Does the rural Negro migrant to the city experience greater deflection from his occupational status orientations than his urban counterparts?[57] How do white and Negro youth differ in respect to all the questions raised above? Research oriented toward obtaining answers for these questions, and similar ones, would have important scientific and practical significance. We believe that a much greater research commitment should be made to obtain these answers, ~~particularly on the part of rural sociologists.~~[58]

Footnotes

1. For a current bibliography of research pertaining to occupational status orientations see William P. Kuvlesky and George W. Ohlendorf, Occupational Aspirations and Expectations: A Bibliography of Research Literature, College Station: Texas A&M University, Department of Agricultural Economics and Sociology, Information Report 66-1, June, 1966.

2. The term "occupational status orientation" includes both aspirations and expectations. The more general term is used because researchers do not always draw a clear distinction between aspiration and expectations. For a discussion of this conceptual problem and its implications see William P. Kuvlesky and Robert C. Bealer, "A Clarification of the Concept 'Occupational Choice'," Rural Sociology (Forthcoming--September, 1966).

3. For evidence see any of the studies cited by William H. Sewell and Alan M. Orenstein, "Community of Residence and Occupational Choice," The American Journal of Sociology, 70 (March, 1965), pp. 551-563. Evaluations of goal-levels held by rural youth can be found in Lee G. Burchinal, Career Choices of Rural Youth in a Changing Society, St. Paul: Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 458, November, 1962 and William P. Kuvlesky, "Occupational Aspirations and Expectations of Rural Youth: Some Suggestions for Action Programs," Paper presented at the ASAW meetings, Jackson, Mississippi, February, 1966. (A limited number of copies of this paper are available upon request.)

4. Among others, see Sewell and Orenstein, op. cit. and Russell Middleton and Charles M. Grigg, "Rural-Urban Differences in Aspirations," Rural Sociology, 24 (December, 1959), pp. 347-354.

5. For evidence, see Richard M. Stephenson, "Mobility Orientation and Stratification of 1,000 Ninth Graders," American Sociological Review, 22 (April, 1957), pp. 204-212; E. Grant Youmans, et. al., After High School What: Highlights of a Study of Career Plans of Negro and White Rural Youth in Three Florida Counties, Gainesville: University of Florida, Cooperative Extension Service, (1965); and Middleton and Grigg, op. cit.

6. Among others, see Lee G. Burchinal, "Differences in Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Farm, Small-Town, and City Boys," Rural Sociology, 26 (June, 1961), pp. 107-121 and John B. Edlefsen and Martin J. Crowe, Teen-Agers' Occupational Aspirations, Pullman: Washington Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 618, July, 1960.

7. Evidence exists that differences in occupational goal-levels are associated with place of residence, socio-economic status, father's occupation, parents' education, peer relationships, a host of different aspects involved in family relationships and school situations, and a number of personality variables. Evidence of these relationships are summarized in a number of reports. See, among others, David Gottlieb and Jon Reeves, Adolescent Behavior in Urban Areas: A Bibliographic Review and Discussion of the

Literature, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963, Parts 1-D and 3-D; Herman J. Peters and James C. Hansen (eds.), Vocational Guidance and Career Development: Selected Readings, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966, Chapters 2 and 3; and Donald E. Super, The Psychology of Careers, New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1957.

8. Seymour M. Lipset, "Social Mobility and Urbanization," Rural Sociology, 20 (September, 1955), pp. 220-228. For a recent review of research indicating that rural and small town migrants experience less occupational mobility than native urbanites see Sewell and Orenstein, op. cit., p. 551.

9. For a recent and extensive review of past research in this problem area see Sewell and Orenstein, ibid. Although these authors conclude that the bulk of the past evidence, as well as their own findings, demonstrate that rural boys tend to have lower occupational goals than urban boys, some of the studies cited clearly refer to expectations.

10. See Archie O. Haller and William H. Sewell, "Farm Residence and Levels of Educational and Occupational Aspiration," The American Journal of Sociology, 62 (January, 1957), pp. 407-411 and Middleton and Grigg, op. cit., respectively. Both of these studies used a stimulus question that would provide responses indicating expectations, not goals. In reference to the Florida study, a lack of "significant" rural-urban differences was found for Negro boys, pp. 350-351. The exceptional nature of the findings from both studies can probably be explained in terms of techniques of measuring "goal-levels" and/or procedures utilized in sampling and analysis.

11. Several investigators have reported findings on occupational goals of rural and urban Negro boys studied separately; however, about all that can be ascertained from these reports is that both types have high goal-levels. In reference to rural Negro boys, see Youmans, et. al., op. cit. For urban Negro boys, see Noel P. Gist and William S. Bennett, Jr., "Aspirations of Negro and White Students," Social Forces, 42 (October, 1963), pp. 40-48 and Aaron Antonovsky and Melvin J. Lerner, "Occupational Aspirations of Lower Class Negro and White Youth," Social Problems, 7 (Fall, 1959), pp. 132-138.

12. In a recent book, Leonard Broom and Norval D. Glenn indicate that the "increased gap between aspirations and attainment" provided a major stimulus for recent Negro protest movements. Transformation of The Negro American, New York: Harper and Row, 1965, pp. 182-183. A similar point of view is evident in a statement by John W. Dyckman indicating that the "Watts uprising" was, in part, due to resentment evolving from the Negroes' inability to attain their expectations. "Some Conditions of Civic Order in an Urbanized World," Daedalus, (Summer, 1966), pp. 802-803. Unfortunately, these assertions are not backed up with empirical evidence. However, assuming there is some validity to them, a consideration of occupational orientations becomes of special significance. A person's job usually provides the vehicle through which he attains other goals.

13. Support for this study was provided by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station as a contribution to station project H-2611.

14. In a recent book Ralph Turner argues that high school youth constitute a "future-oriented society" (p. 16 and p. 212). He thoroughly documents this assertion and relates it to such ideas as the achievement motive, vertical mobility, marginality, anticipatory socialization, etc. The Social Context of Ambition: A Study of High School Seniors in Los Angeles, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing, Co., 1964. See particularly Chapters 1 and 8.

15. For a strong supporting statement and evidence for this assertion see Archibald O. Haller and Irwin W. Miller, The Occupational Aspiration Scale: Theory, Structure, and Correlates, East Lansing: Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, Technical Bulletin 288, 1963, p. 5 and Seymour M. Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, Social Mobility in Industrial Society, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962, p. 97 and p. 228.

16. For an elaboration of this view and an attempt toward greater conceptual clarity see Kuvlesky and Bealer, op. cit. A strong argument for the need to separate the ideas of aspiration and expectation is given by Stephenson, op. cit., p. 83. Also see Peter Blau, et. al., "Occupational Choice: A Conceptual Framework," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 9 (July, 1956), pp. 535-536.

17. For a review of these studies see Kuvlesky and Bealer, op. cit. In most reports of research comparing aspirations and expectations, the comparisons are made on an aggregate level. However, findings of a recent North Carolina study indicate that approximately half of the respondents, Negro and white, experienced anticipatory deflection from occupational goals. Thomas H. Nunalee, III and Lawrence W. Drabick, Occupational Desires and Expectations of North Carolina High School Seniors, Raleigh: North Carolina State University, Departments of Agricultural Education and Rural Sociology, Educational Research Series No. 3, June, 1965, pp. 7-17. Walter L. Slocum reports similar findings from an earlier study of high school seniors. Occupational and Educational Plans of High School Seniors From Farm and Non-Farm Homes, Pullman: Washington Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 564, February, 1956.

18. It should be noted that anticipatory deflection from goals may be positive or negative--toward higher or lower prestige occupations. Support for this assertion is provided by both studies cited above in fn. 17.

19. For a detailed statement of this relationship and its significance, see in particular Stephenson, op. cit., pp. 209-210. For further support of this contention see Slocum, op. cit.; E. Grant Youmans, "Social Factors in the Work Attitudes and Interests of 12th Grade Michigan Boys," The Journal of Educational Sociology, 28 (September, 1954) pp. 35-48; Harry K. Schwarzweller, Sociocultural Factors and the Career Aspirations and Plans of Rural Kentucky High School Seniors, Lexington: Kentucky Agri-

cultural Experiment Station, Progress Report 94, September, 1960; Paul Glick, Jr., "Occupational Values and Anticipated Occupational Frustration of Agricultural College Students," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 42 (March, 1964), pp. 674-679; M. E. John and Kathleen Meyer, Adolescents: Their Interests, Aspirations, and Models, University Park: Pennsylvania Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 695, 1962: and H. Kirk Dansereau, "Work and the Teen-Age Blue-Collarite," in Arthur B. Shostak and William Gomberg (eds.), Blue-Collar World: Studies of the American Worker, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964, pp. 184-185.

20. Nunalee and Drabick, op. cit., pp. 9-10.

21. That the idea, aspiration, can be broken down into several analytical elements has been proposed in several recent publications. For detailed consideration of two somewhat different analytical schemes see Haller and Miller, op. cit. and Kuvlesky and Bealer, op. cit. The idea of intensity of orientation is developed in the latter report.

22. Leonard Reissman, "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," American Sociological Review, 18 (June, 1953), pp. 233-242; Russell R. Dynes, et. al., "Levels of Occupational Aspiration: Some Aspects of Family Experience As a Variable," American Sociological Review, 21 (April, 1956), pp. 212-215; and Frederick C. Fliegel, "Aspirations of Low-Income Farmers and Their Performance and Potential For Change," Rural Sociology, 24 (September, 1959), pp. 205-214.

23. The intensity or strength of occupational aspirations can be viewed as a very specific form of David C. McClelland's more general idea of "achievement motive." The Achievement Motive, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953. It seems logical to expect that, everything else being equal, of two respondents having different intensities of desire for similar goals, the one with the strongest desire would have a better chance of attaining it. This proposition is developed in more detail in Kuvlesky and Bealer, op. cit.

24. The Middleton and Grigg report, noted previously, appears to offer the only information directly relevant for the problem at hand. The authors proposed that the explanation for the lack of differences might be the high rate of high school drop-outs among Negro boys--no attempt was made to include drop-outs in the study. However, an examination of the instrument used to obtain an indicator for "occupational aspiration" reveals that the responses obtained refer to expectations and not aspirations. The stimulus question used was, "In what occupation do you think that you will most likely be working ten years from now?" (Middleton and Grigg, op. cit., p. 349). It is our judgment that this measure does not accurately reflect differences in goal-levels.

25. All sophomores present the day of the interview participated--no attempt was made to contact any who were absent. The respondents came from 23 different high schools of which only one had experienced more than "token"

integration. The size of the sophomore classes in these schools ranged from 5 to 70 students. Of the 13 all-Negro schools contacted, all had fewer than 30 sophomores and more than half had less than 20.

26. According to 1960 Census designations for these counties. United States Census of Population, 1960, Volume 1, Part 45 - Texas.

27. For a detailed comparison of the three counties with Texas and the United states on these attributes and a number of other key indicators of socio-economic conditions see Table 1 in Appendix A.

28. The procedures used in selection of the sample provided respondents representing extremes in rural and urban communities of residence in reference to the locational and size of place-density characteristics usually associated with the rural-urban distinction. A discussion of this ecological dimension of "rurality" and a consideration of other dimensions that often enter into a definition of the construct "rural" occurs in Robert C. Bealer, et. al., "The Meaning of 'Rurality' in American Society: Some Implications of Alternative Definitions," Rural Sociology, 30 (September, 1965), pp. 255-266. Also, in both cases a purposeful attempt was made to obtain location units that could be labeled economically depressed. That we did this, can be easily confirmed for the rural units by inspection of Table 1 in Appendix A. We have no such concrete evidence for the urban ward, but, we did inspect the neighborhoods (mixed residential and industrial) of this ward and on this basis feel safe in concluding that it was economically depressed.

29. One rural and three urban respondents were eliminated from the analysis because data for them was not complete.

30. The indicator used to elicit the respondent's occupational goal was, "If you were completely free to choose any job, what would you most desire as a lifetime kind of work?" It was assumed that use of the word "lifetime" would elicit responses indicating long-run or ultimate goals. A similar question, occurring on a different page later in the schedule, was used to obtain expected occupational attainment: "What kind of job do you really expect to have most of your life?"

31. This method of measurement was selected because it has been widely used in other studies of this general problem and would facilitate comparison of findings. In addition, the use of qualitative categories permits observations pertaining to differences in the nature of occupational status orientations that are not possible when the responses are transformed into occupational prestige levels--another method of measurement used in some past studies. Modifications of the Census scheme (Classified Index of Occupations and Industries, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1960) consisted of several changes other than the subdivision of the professional, technical, and kindred class (see fn. 32). The usual clerical, sales and service categories were collapsed into one. The farm owner and manager responses were included with the

managerial class because few respondents indicated these as either a goal (N=3) or expectation (N=2). Enlisted military and law enforcement responses were classified as operatives and skilled labor, respectively. The Census classifies these jobs as craftsmen and operatives, respectively.

32. "High professional" consists of those occupations that normally require degrees beyond the B.S. or B.A. (doctor, college professor, lawyer, etc.)--these generally have North-Hatt occupational prestige scores of 80 or higher. The "glamour" category consists of those occupations having a glamorous connotation and usually coded as professional--pop singer, band leader, and professional sports. The "low professional" constitutes a residual category which includes all other professional, technical, and kindred occupations--it was found that most of these have North-Hatt prestige scores ranging from 70 to 79.

33. As an example, if a respondent had indicated doctor (1) as a goal and janitor (8) as an expectation he was scored (1-8) as having experienced negative anticipatory deflection.

34. This is a multiple item scale. For each item the respondent is asked to indicate whether or not he would be willing to sacrifice some other, presumably valued, end to obtain the goal under consideration. For more detailed descriptions and demonstrations of the scale's utility see the reports previously cited in fn. 22.

35. These included goals in reference to income, education, residence, family, material possessions, and leisure. The instrument is given in Appendix A.

36. The possible range in scores was from 1 to 7--the smaller the score the higher the intensity of aspiration indicated. The frequencies with which each of the score values occurred are shown in Table 2 of Appendix A.

37. In a pre-test this instrument was found to be superior to a question that simply asked the respondent to indicate his level of desire for his occupational goal. In the latter case, almost all responses indicated very high or high desires. Forcing the respondent to make a selection between his occupational goal and six other normally valued ends, was thought to provide a measure that more approximately simulated reality. One major disadvantage was found in using this instrument--it proved to be difficult for some of the poorly educated rural Negroes involved.

38. The high level class consists of high and low professional and glamour categories. O eratives and unskilled were combined to form the low level class. The remainder of the categories were combined into the intermediate class. Although one can argue, with some justification, that the managerial class should be included in the high level and/or that the clerical category should be included in the low level, it was our decision to be conservative in reference to the formation of the polar opposite goal-levels. At any rate we consider the use of three goal-level categories to be an improvement upon the more frequently used dichotomous schemes of blue-collar and white-collar or professional and other. For

an example of the use of the former, see Middleton and Grigg, op. cit. and in reference to the latter see Sewell and Orenstein, op. cit.

39. These findings directly contradict a conclusion reached by Middleton and Grigg in reference to an earlier Florida study; for a detailed critique of this study, see fn. 24. Although we have not been able to locate another study directly concerned with ascertaining rural-urban differences among Negro youth, our finding that both groupings have relatively high goal-levels is comparable to what has been observed elsewhere. See Appendix B for a comparison of our findings with others.

40. This observation does not appear in the tabular presentation of the data because farm aspirants were placed in the managerial category. The fact that this observation corresponds exactly with what was found for a comparable grouping of Negro boys from low-income rural counties in Florida may indicate that a lack of desire to farm is characteristic of these youth in the South, (Youmans, et. al., op. cit.). The fact that these two studies were done in widely separated parts of the South, were substantially separated in time, and involved different age groupings enhances the probable general nature of this conclusion.

41. This finding supports our supposition that the lack of differences observed by Middleton and Grigg might be due to the fact that they appeared to be observing expectations. Assuming this to be the case, their observations lend support to our findings (See fn. 24).

42. This is a rate of anticipatory deflection very similar to that (37 percent) observed by Slocum in a much earlier study of, presumably, white youth in the state of Washington. On the other hand, the rate observed here is much lower than that observed by Nunalee and Drabick for Negro and white youth, of both sexes, in a recent North Carolina study. Part of the difference between our study and the North Carolina one may be explained by the different techniques used to measure deflection--Nunalee and Drabick used classes of North-Hatt scores.

43. This compares with what was observed in both studies cited above in fn. 42.

44. Intensity of aspiration (strength of desire) levels were formed by dividing the distribution of IA scores into three parts as follows: "Strong" (1, 2), "Intermediate" (3,4) and "Weak" (5,6,7). The score of seven occurred infrequently and, thus, was combined with the next two lower scores. See Table 2 in Appendix A for the frequency distribution of scores.

45. Lipset, op. cit.

46. As indicated previously, findings from studies by Haller and Sewell and Middleton and Grigg were interpreted (by the investigators) as indicating such evidence. But, in both cases, it is our judgment that this interpretation of their findings can be questioned on several counts. Of prime importance in this respect, is the fact that both studies appeared to be eliciting responses indicating expectations rather than goals.

47. Stephenson concludes that "While it is true that both plans and aspirations tend to follow socio-economic position, the plans are considerably more class based than the aspirations," op. cit., p. 487.

48. We feel safe in assuming that our rural respondents generally have lower socio-economic status than our urban ones. An inspection of usual SES indicators for our respondents--father's occupation and parent's education--support this supposition. Obviously, this apparent contradiction requires research directly testing the Stephenson proposition as it applies to class differences among Negroes.

49. Lipset reasons that size of community regulates youth's exposure to a broad range of occupational alternatives; which in turn influences occupational aspirations. Consequently, he argues that urban youth have exposure to a broader range of alternatives, resulting in higher aspirations, op. cit. Sewell and Orenstein expand upon this explanation and note that the proposed relationship between exposure to a varying range of occupations and level of aspiration has never been empirically confirmed, op. cit.

50. Evidence that occupational goals influence both subsequent occupational attainment and self-evaluations is provided in the unpublished Ph.D. dissertation of the senior author of this paper. The Non-Attainment of Adolescents' Occupational Aspirations: A Longitudinal Study of Rural Pennsylvania Males, The Pennsylvania State University, 1965, Chapter 3. If, everything else being equal, two respondents aspire to the same goal but differ in their desire to attain it, the one having the strongest desire could be logically expected to have a higher probability for success. For greater elaboration of this hypothesis see Kuvlesky and Bealer, op. cit.

51. As an aside, it is interesting to note that while numerous investigators (including us) have attempted to determine the nature of rural and urban differences in occupational orientations (and dozens have tried to find what influences the development of these phenomena), to our knowledge, no one has attempted to directly determine whether or not rural-urban differences in occupational orientations actually influence attainment.

52. Results of several other studies support ours in this respect. See Appendix B for comparisons.

53. Among others, see Broom and Glenn, op. cit., pp. 182 and 183 and Dyckman, op. cit., pp. 802-803.

54. The primary impediments to occupational mobility are low levels and poor quality of formal education, prejudice in employment recruitment, and structural barriers to admittance in labor unions. For a thorough consideration of this subject see C. Franklin Edwards, "Community and Class Realities: The Ordeal of Change," Daedalus, 2, (Winter, 1966), pp. 1-23 and Oscar Handlin, "The Goals of Integration," ibid., pp. 268-286.

55. Most of the literature on this subject displays pessimism in evaluating prospects for the short-term amelioration of this problem. Such an attitude seems to be justified. Amelioration would require extensive changes in the status orientation levels of Negroes or a dramatic reduction of barriers to mobility. Any such change would involve great costs--social, economic, and psychic--and a prolonged period of time. Eli Ginzberg, in a generally optimistic presentation, cautions that changes in the institutionalized patterns impeding Negro mobility will require a long period of time. The Negro Potential, New York: Columbia University Press, 1956, pp. 137-138. A direct attempt to lower the aspirations and expectation levels of Negro youth is not likely to occur in our achievement-oriented society.

56. For examples of this contention, and a discussion of the reasoning supporting it see Broom and Glenn, op. cit. and Dyckman, op. cit.

57. Our study indicates that the rural Negroes hold expectation-levels comparable to urban youth; however, it is highly probable that their occupational attainments will be generally below that of urban Negroes.

58. A. Lee Coleman made a strong plea for such research in his 1965 Presidential Address to the Rural Sociological Society. "The Rural-Urban Variable in Race Relations," Rural Sociology, 30 (December, 1965), pp. 393-406.

APPENDIX A

Table 1. A Comparison of Rural Counties Used in the Study with Texas and the U. S. On Key Indicators of Socio-Economic Condition.*

Place	Total Population (Thousands)	Negro (Percent)	Low Income Families[1] (Percent)	Median Family Income	Median Years of School (Adults)	Percent of Labor Force Unskilled[2]
San Jacinto	6	52	69	$1,737	7	54
Burleson	11	31	59	2,451	8	43
Leon	9	38	67	1,946	9	44
Texas	9,581	13	29	4,884	10	36
U. S.	179,323	11	21	5,657	10	36

*All information was obtained from 1960 Census data.

[1]Families with annual incomes below $3000.

[2]Operatives and Laborers.

APPENDIX A

Table 2. A Comparison on Frequency of Occurrence of Intensity of Aspiration Scores for Rural and Urban Negro Boys.

Intensity Score	Respondents		
	Rural (N=97)	Urban (N=108)	Total (N=205)
	%		
1 (Highest)	6	13	10
2	28	41	35
3	25	17	21
4	18	15	16
5	12	4	8
6	10	8	9
7 (Lowest)	1	2	1
Total	100	100	100
Mean Score	3.4	2.9	3.1

APPENDIX A

Intensity of Aspiration Instrument

Listed below are a number of things that most young people look forward to. Rank them in order of their importance to you. For the one you think is most important check number 1 in front of it; for the next most important one check number 2, and so on until you have a number checked for each one. Read over the entire list before answering the question. (Check only one number beside each sentence and check each different number only once.)

Order of Importance to You

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Having lots of free time to do what I want.
____	____	____	____	____	____	____	To develop my mind and get all the education I want.
____	____	____	____	____	____	____	To earn as much money as I can.
____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Getting the job I want most.
____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Living in the kind of place I like best.
____	____	____	____	____	____	____	Having the kind of house, car, furniture, and other things like this I want.
____	____	____	____	____	____	____	To get married and raise a family.

CHECK YOUR ANSWERS! You should have each number checked only once and a single number should be checked for each statement.

APPENDIX B

A Comparison Between Negro Boys From Texas and Other States on Occupational Goals

Rural Boys

A recent study of Negro youth from three low-income rural counties in Florida, using a measure of occupational goals almost identical to ours, presents an unusual opportunity for detailed comparison of findings on rural Negro boys, Table 1.[1]

Table 1. A Comparison of Florida and Texas Rural Negro Boys' Occupational Goals.

Goal	Respondents	
	Florida (N=79)	Texas (N=97)
	----------%----------	
Professional	61	49
Managerial	1	3
Clerical	3	10
Skilled labor	18	11
Semi-skilled labor	1	18
Unskilled labor	0	7
Farm operator	2	2
No answer	14	0
Total	100	100

[1] E. Grant Youmans, et. al., After High School What: Highlights of a Study of Career Plans of Negro and White Youth in Three Florida Counties, Gainesville: University of Florida, Cooperative Extension Service, (1965), p. 13.

APPENDIX B

Of particular significance, is the fact that both studies indicated that most rural Negro boys had high goals and few desired to become farmers. It can be seen that approximately two-thirds of both groupings aspired to white-collar types of jobs; however, a larger proportion of the Florida respondents desired professional positions.

The most glaring differences between the two goal profiles exist in reference to the lower skilled blue-collar categories. One-fourth of the Texas boys indicated desires for these types of jobs compared to almost none of the Florida boys. This difference probably can be attributed to differences in procedures used to code responses. In all probability, many of the large number of responses coded as "no information" in the Florida study, as well as some of those coded as skilled, were coded as either unskilled or operative in our study.

Urban Boys

Several studies provided some basis for comparison, on goal-levels, with our findings on urban boys--a Missouri study by Gist and Bennett and one made by Antonovsky and Lerner in "upstate" New York.[2] The comparison is made somewhat cautiously because of a lack of thorough specification of the measurement technique used in the New York study and the use of NH prestige scores to determine goal-levels in the Missouri study.

Although there is considerable variation in the percentages, clear majorities of the respondents in all three studies were reported to have high goal

---

[2]Noel P. Gist and William S. Bennett, Jr., "Aspirations of Negro and White Students," Social Forces, 42 (October, 1963), p. 46 and Aaron Antonovsky and Melvin J. Lerner, "Occupational Aspirations of Lower Class Negro and White Youth," Social Problems, 7 (Fall, 1959), p. 134.

APPENDIX B

Table 2. A Comparison of Missouri, New York, and Texas Urban Negro Boys' Occupational Goal-Levels.

Goal-Level	Respondents		
	Missouri (N=122)	Texas (N=108)	New York (N=61)
	----------%		
High*	59	78	64
Medium	39	14	Not reported
Low	2	8	Not reported
Total	100	100	Not reported

*For the Texas and New York studies this level includes all professional, semi-professional, and managerial occupations.

levels, Table 2. No further comparison is possible with the New York report. However, the Missouri respondents were reported to have a much larger proportion of intermediate goals and a much lower proportion of high goals than the Texas boys. This is probably accounted for by the fact that the cutting point on NH scores between the high and medium levels used by the Missouri investigators was high enough to exclude semi-professional and/or technical jobs from their high level category.

Summary

About all that can be safely concluded from these comparisons, is that rural and urban Negro boys have extremely high goal levels, relative to their opportunities. The difficulties involved in making these comparisons clearly indicate research inefficiency resulting from a failure to use comparable techniques of measurement. The accumulative power of research findings in this problem area suffers immeasurably from our inability to reach a consensus on a single measurement device.

APPENDIX C

IA and Anticipatory Deflection

A cross-classification of mean IA scores by residence and whether or not respondents experienced deflection, demonstrated a lack of meaningful differences, Table 1. Similar results were obtained when the proportional rates of anticipatory deflection associated with each absolute IA score were compared for rural and urban respondents, Table 2. Furthermore, an examination of the mean IA scores associated with anticipatory deflection from particular goals, produced mixed results, Table 3. It can be inferred from these observations that intensity of aspiration as measured here, was not associated with anticipatory deflection from occupational goals for either rural or urban Negro boys.

Several possible explanations can be given for this unexpected result. One possible explanation is that the instrument used to indicate IA did not give a valid measure of the phenomenon. What seems to us to be a more likely explanation, is that our instrument, while valid, is not ideal. Its ability to discriminate is severely limited by the small range in possible scores. Also, it is rather complex and proved to present a problem for some of our respondents--particularly the low-income rural boys. Perhaps the use of another instrument to measure IA would have demonstrated a relationship with anticipatory deflection. On the other hand, it is possible that no meaningful relationship exists between these two variables. Whatever the correct answer is, and this can only be determined by additional research, intensity of aspiration might have utility for explaining other phenomena--certainly of job expectation, occupational attainment, job satisfaction, feelings of deprivation, or other related forms of behavior. Also, whatever the utility of IA, future research is needed to determine what variables do influence differences in the

APPENDIX C

nature and extent of anticipatory deflection from occupational goals.

Table 1. Mean Intensity of Aspiration Scores for Respondents Experiencing and Not Experiencing Anticipatory Deflection by Rural-Urban Residence.

Residence	Not Deflected	Deflected
Rural	3.4	3.3
Urban	2.8	3.0

Table 2. A Comparison of Rural and Urban Rates of Anticipatory Deflection by Intensity of Aspiration Scores.

Intensity Scores	Percent Deflected	
	Rural	Urban
1	36	50
2	19	26
3	45	42
4	31	35
5	60	33
6	22	30
7	50	0

APPENDIX C

Table 3. Mean Intensity of Aspiration Scores of Rural and Urban Respondents, Cross-Classified By Occupational Goal and Occurrence or Lack of Occurrence of Anticipatory Deflection.

A. Rural Respondents

Goal	Not Deflected	Deflected
	----------Mean Scores----------	
High Professional	3.8	4.5
Low Professional	3.3	3.0
Glamour	3.5	2.8
Managerial	2.5	3.3
Clerical and Sales	3.7	3.7
Skilled	3.0	3.0
Operatives	3.3	3.4
Unskilled	4.2	3.0

B. Urban Respondents

Goal	Not Deflected	Deflected
	----------Mean Scores----------	
High Professional	2.8	2.7
Low Professional	2.9	2.4
Glamour	2.3	3.7
Managerial	3.2	3.3
Clerical and Sales	3.3	6.0
Skilled	3.2	3.0
Operatives	3.0	4.3
Unskilled	-	-